1 DAVID ELLISON: Just as an aside. My father worked at Sandia National Laboratories in the 1960s and has told me some of the things that went on there. And despite the confidence that some people who still work there and as the son of somebody who worked there with stories from there, I wouldn't put all that much confidence in it. In fact, the very famous movies that they have of these casks being tested that were done in the 1960s were conducted at lower speeds than they're talking about. They're talking about running these trains and trucks at normal highway speeds. And, for instance, if you were going on a highway at 65 miles an hour in a truck and it swerved and the cask comes loose and it's hurdling down the highway at 60 miles an hour, because it lost a little bit of its speed when it came unchained, and it hits a truck from the other direction at 60 miles an hour, that's 120 miles an hour and if you're right next to Lake Erie, the cask might get knocked into lake Erie. So it's not a big stretch to find a cask hitting something at a 120 miles on hour sideways.

2 I was in the middle of a comment on the environmental justice aspects of on site storage versus moving the waste to Yucca Mountain. And I did not find any positive aspect of the no action scenario number one, being attributed to the salvation of possible transportation accidents, unplanned exposures, diminished land values along the transportation routes and the most, unfortunate, ruining of the Yucca Mountain location and surrounding urban areas of Las Vegas, Los Angeles and elsewhere by the placement of the waste at that location. The negative impacts in terms of environmental justice issues are much greater, in fact, if the waste is removed from where it currently is located and shipped through urban, often poor communities, next to railroad tracks and highways and dumped into a whole out back on the Indian reservation as planned at
3 Yucca Mountain. The no action scenario number two is absolutely irresponsible but a highly likely scenario given the nature of the nuclear industry and the regulating community. It is important that the people of the United States, their government, the DOE and the commercial utilities not allow this scenario to develop in a de facto manner. We all have the responsibility to monitor their actions so as to not allow it to develop. Collectively, the world population and the more responsible governments of the world have a responsibility to prevent this scenario from
4 developing within this country and elsewhere on our planet. Section 7.3.2.7 claims that the employment of personnel involved with construction and maintenance of 77 facilities is the only contributing factor in socioeconomic impacts due to on site storage. I would comment that the potential of collective responsibility for the safe guarding of these wastes for the time period considered would allow the creation of much greater socioeconomic impact. Participation in the activity of oversight, construction and maintenance of the storage facilities beyond the previously mentioned 100 year planned obsolescence. The possibility of tourism and pilgrimages and educational and interpretational opportunities to understand and contemplate the profoundly deep social and economic commitment that human ancestors made to nuclear technology and the ongoing efforts of current generations to keep its waste products from contaminating the planet, could have enormous social, economic and political impacts, which are not even alluded to in the DEIS.

5... Furthermore, the actual economic impact of the no action scenario number two, and this is basically ignoring the problem and burying the waste on site, is not elaborated upon and would include immediate short term economic benefit to the DOE, public and the commercial utilities. This aspect of the problem, the potential unprofitability of dealing with this waste contributes to

..5 the notion that Yucca Mountain is the only answer because the utilities and waste handling contractors are already lined up at the trough like pigs. To address this problem involves huge economic subsidies by the people through their government which would employ at great expense large nuclear industry contractors to hire low cost work forces, who would then build railroads, drive trucks and engineer cask carriages to shuffle the waste around the country. The potential for local economic development in finding ways to collectively and democratically secure and isolate these wastes well into the future is great, yet the DEIS fails completely to explore it.

6 In summary, I don't think that the two scenarios for so called no action are at all similar and are not developed adequately to fully understand what the impact of long term population-wide maintenance of the isolation of these wastes means. I think that this failure to create a reasonable scenario for long term on site storage, allows no adequate comparison to the environmental impact of transportation and storage of this waste at Yucca Mountain and I would request that more investigation be done on the possibility of long term on site or near on site storage where the population, as a whole, is involved in the process of maintaining the isolation of these wastes from the environment. Thank you.